

Appl. No. : 09/514,633
Filed : February 28, 2000

55. (Previously Claim No. 38) A module as in Claim 35, wherein the conductive path extends upward from the first contact to a first point above a level of the upper series of contacts, over to a second point generally above the second contact, and down to the second contact.

56. (Previously Claim No. 39) A module as in Claim 35, wherein at least a portion of the conductive path is supported by one of the first and second support structures.

57. (Previously Claim No. 40) A module as in Claim 35, wherein the conductive path comprises a conductive trace and at least one solder filled via.

COMMENTS

This supplemental preliminary amendment is in response to a telephone call made by the Examiner on March 15, 2001. In the telephone conversation, the Examiner requested that we renumber the claims and submit an Information Disclosure Statement. Also enclosed herewith is an Information Disclosure Statement.

With respect to on-going litigation, as set forth in the parent reissue application, Simple Technology filed suit against Dense-Pac MicroSystems, Inc. for patent infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5,514,907 in the District Court for the Central District of California, on September 28, 1998. The docket number of the case is SA CV 98-822 AHS (EEx). Pursuant to M.P.E.P. §§ 1442.04 and 2001.06(c), Applicant has attached as Exhibit A, the Court's ruling denying a Motion for Summary Judgement of Invalidity of Claim 12 of U.S. Patent Re. 36,916. Also attached as Exhibit B, are various documents associated with the Summary Judgement Motion of Invalidity.

On February 21, 2001, Simple Technology filed a new lawsuit against Dense-Pac MicroSystems, Inc. for patent infringement of U.S. Patent Re. 36,916 in the District Court for the Central District of California. The docket number of the case is 01-231AHS. On March 13, 2001, Dense-Pac Microsystems filed an Answer. Copies of these papers are enclosed herewith as Exhibit C.

In addition, Applicant has renumbered the claims as requested by the Examiner. It is our understanding that the Examiner desires to continue the claim numbering sequence set forth in the parent reissue application. By way of background, the parent reissued application

Appl. No. : 09/514,633
Filed : February 28, 2000

was originally filed with Claims 1-34. Claims 35-51 were then added during prosecution of the parent reissue application. Claims 48-51, however, were not allowed during prosecution of the parent reissue application. Accordingly, ~~35-38~~ in this continuation reissue application have been renumbered to be Claims 52-57.

Applicant notes, that on December 18, 2000, new rule C.F.R. § 1.177(b) entitled "Reissue in divisions" now states:

"(b) If applicant files more than one application for the reissue of a single patent...The number of any added claims in any of the multiple reissue applications must follow the number of the highest number original patent claim."

Thus, upon allowance of any of these claims, it appears that the allowed Claims will begin with Claim No. 16, because the highest numbered original patent claim was Claim No. 15.

Applicant respectfully requests entry of these amendments before examination by the Examiner on the merits begins. If Applicant has misunderstood the Examiner, or if further issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned such that any remaining issues may be promptly resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: March 21, 2001

By: John R. King

John R. King
Registration No. 34,362
Attorney of Record
620 Newport Center Drive
Sixteenth Floor
Newport Beach, CA 92660
(949) 760-0404